



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Law and Order in Industry. By JULIUS HENRY COHEN. New York: Macmillan, 1916. Pp. xviii+292. \$1.50.

This is a fair-minded and authoritative history of the famous protocol in the New York garment industry—one of the first and most significant attempts to bring order into a field in which anarchy was writ large. The author, a member of the New York bar, was a joint framer of the protocol and attorney for the employers' association throughout the life of that agreement. The protocol has been so well advertised (and apparently, like the honor plan in prisons, overpraised as a panacea) that only a word as to its history and meaning is necessary. It was a treaty of peace signed late in 1910 to end a very bitter strike which involved nearly sixty thousand workers in the garment industry. After five years of ups and downs, the treaty was abrogated. This book is a summary of the reasons for that breakdown and of the lessons learned during that period. The protocol has been called a lawyer's scheme—somewhat like John Locke's famous Virginia constitution. Mr. Cohen conceives the whole experiment as an attempt to carry over into industry two legal principles: (1) the natural method of parliament and law courts, "orderly debate, study, controversy . . . but decision by a process of reasoning, not of coercion by one power against another"—in other words, substitution of the "time-wasting art of discussion," persuasion, and compromise for force and war; (2) that "industry itself ought to assume the responsibility for its own sanitary conditions, as the Bar assumes responsibility for the ethical conduct of its members." The second principle seems to have succeeded; the first succeeded only in part, for the agreement broke down. However, it seems impossible to believe that its lessons in method will be utterly lost. For many manufacturers learned to accept the principle of collective bargaining, and many workers learned the necessity of compromise (e.g., substitution of the preferential union shop for the closed shop). The adjudication of some 16,000 grievances in five years could not fail to yield certain concrete inductions. That the protocol is not valueless may also be inferred from its spread to other cities.

Why, then, did so valuable an experiment fail? Several reasons conspired to this: failure to educate the rank and file of both workers and employers to its real meaning; the refusal of employers to allow the slightest interference with their right to discharge (the issue of "firing") and failure of labor leaders to restrain annoying shop strikes—that is, lack of discipline on both sides; the multitude of petty grievances; litigation made too easy; the difficulty of standardizing the hundreds of

small shops; the weight and complexity of protocol machinery; finally, the feeling of some employers that they were being made sociological guinea-pigs and their shops social laboratories.

The space limits of this review preclude even naming the knotty economic problems which the author's analysis implies must be solved before peace can be established. That they not only are soluble but must be solved, he clearly believes, for he ends with this trumpet call: "We cannot go back to savagery in industry, whatever it costs to go forward." As of particular interest to sociologists, the chapter analyzing the women's garment industry may be recommended as collateral reading on fashion, imitation, prestige, etc. The discussion of "social" shops and large factories illustrates the contrast between ethnic and interest groups. It is to be regretted that this, on the whole, well-written book is marred by so gross a literary lapse as the charge that union leaders "created a Frankenstein"!

A. J. TODD

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Social Adaptation: A Study in the Development of the Doctrine of Adaptation as a Theory of Social Progress. By LUCIUS MOODY BRISTOL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1915. Pp. xii+356. \$2.00.

This semi-historical study is an attempt to review the literature of sociology from the standpoint of the single category of adaptation. But so broad is the category itself, in its fourfold aspect and passive material and active and passive spiritual or social adaptation, as here used, that it becomes in effect a study of the forces—physical, biological, and mental—underlying social evolution. The author takes for his general point of departure the biologists, anthropogeographers, and sociologists of the early nineteenth century, and develops the significant trends in the adaptive-developmental theory of society to the present time. As indicated, he does not confine his attention to sociologists alone, but draws pertinent data from such writers as Lamarck, Darwin, Weismann, DeVries, Mendel, Nietzsche, Pearson, Ripley, Buckle, Carlyle, and others. His 261 pages of exposition of the theories of others may, without attaching too much significance to the mere fact of space, be distributed according to the countries or institutions represented as follows: United States 93, France 63, Great Britain 59, Germany and Austria 42, Harvard University 31.5, and Belgium and Holland each